

PTG

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,302	06/12/2000	Ryan A. Danner	CIS00-2410	5363

7590 09/17/2003  
 Barry W Chapin Esq  
 Chapin & Huang LLC  
 Westborough Office Park  
 1700 West Park Drive  
 Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

BOUTAH, ALINA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P24

**Office Action Summary**

Application N .

09/592,302

Applicant(s)

DANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Alina N Boutah

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0164000 by Cohen et al (hereby Cohen) in view of USPN 6,501,832 issued to Saylor et al (hereby Saylor).

Regarding claim 1, Cohen teaches in a server, a method for providing information suitable for audio output, the method comprising:

receiving a first set of information over a network based on a request for the first set of information [Abstract; 0011-0012];

accessing a marked document in response to receiving the first set of information [0035];  
and

generating a second set of information suitable for audio output based on the first set of information and the tagged document [Abstract; 0011-0012].

Cohen fails to explicitly teach accessing a “tagged” document. Saylor teaches accessing a tagged document (col. 18, lines 45-65). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2143

skill in the art would have been motivated to access a tagged document in order to facilitate user in obtaining the specified document.

Regarding claim 2, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: the step of receiving the first set of information comprises receiving a web page based on a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) request for the web page [Abstract; 0011-0012].

However, Cohen fails to expressly teach: the step of accessing the tagged document comprises accessing an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document; and the step of generating the second set of information comprises generating filtered web content suitable for audio output based on the web page and the XML document.

Saylor teaches the step of accessing the tagged document comprising accessing an Extensible Markup Language (XML) document (col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 4, lines 46-58; col. 8, lines 14-36; col. 10, lines 17-28); and the step of generating the second set of information comprising generating filtered web content suitable for audio output based on the web page and the XML document (col. 8, lines 14-36).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Cohen with the teaching of Saylor by incorporating the use of XML-based audio output in order to make it possible users to interact with web servers by telephones, thus allowing users to access information without having to purchase new equipments (col. 1, lines 40-50).

Regarding claim 3, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of receiving the first set of information based on a request for the first set of information comprises the steps of: receiving speech information specifying the first set of information [0026]; generating a text request for the first set of information based on an acoustic speech recognition technique applied to the speech information [figure 6; 0049-0050][, and submitting the text request over the network [0049].

Regarding claim 4, Cohen teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the step of generating the text request comprises interpreting at least one primitive construct based on the speech information [0022].

Regarding claim 5, Cohen the method of claim 4, further comprising the step of generating at least one additional primitive construct based on a request for a user-defined command [0011].

Regarding claim 6, Cohen teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the step of generating the text request comprises applying a case-logic technique to the speech information [0022].

Regarding claim 7, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing the tagged document in response to receiving the first set of information comprises: determining an identity of the request for the first set of information, and accessing the tagged document based on the identity of the request [0030; 0035].

Regarding claim 8, Cohen teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the identity of the request is based on the least one of an identifier for an originator of the request and the identifier for a destination of the request [0035].

Regarding claim 9, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of generating the second set of information suitable for audio output comprises: selecting at least one portion of the first set of information that is suitable for audio output; and generating the second set of information based on selecting the east least one portion of the first set of information [0035].

Regarding claim 10, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of generating the second set of information suitable for audio output comprises: generating text data suitable for audio output based on the first set of information and the tagged document, and generating audio based on the text data [0035-0036].

Regarding claim 11, Cohen teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the step of generating the text data suitable for audio output comprises generating at least one response and the step of generating the audio data based on the text data comprises applying a text-to-speech (TTS) technique to the at least one response [0022].

Regarding claim 12, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of accessing the tagged document is performed based on the request for the first set of information and approximately concurrently with the step of receiving the first set of information [0035].

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 13, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of the first set of information, the tagged document and the second set of information is at least one of a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) page, and Extensible Markup Language (XML) page, a Virtual Reality Modeling Language (VRML) page, and a Standard Generic Markup Language (SGML) page [0034].

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Cohen and Saylor teaches a system for providing information suitable for audio output, the system comprising: a document database configured for storing a plurality of tagged documents (Saylor: figure 1); and a server comprising an executable resources, wherein the executable resource performs functions similar to those of claim 1 (please see claim 1 rejection above).

Claims 15-26 are similar to claims 2-13, respectively, therefore are also rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 27-28, 29-30, 31-32 are similar to claims 1 and 2, respectively, therefore are also rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Cohen and Saylor teaches a method for navigating a web by voice in a server configured for executing voice web applications, the method comprising limitations similar to those of claims 1 and 2 combined, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2143

Claim 34 is similar to claim 3, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 35-37 are similar to claims 7, 8, and 10, respectively, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US Pub. No. 2002/0131561 by GIFFORD et al.
2. US Pub. No. 2002/0124100 Adams, Jeffrey B.
3. USPN 6,366,651 issued to Griffith et al.
4. USPN 6,496,931 issued to Rajchel et al.
5. USPN 5,915,001 issued to Uppaluru, Premkumar V.
6. USPN 6,377,927 issued to Loghmani et al.
7. USPN 6,549,612 issued to Gifford et al.
8. USPN 5,884,262 issued to Wise et al.
9. USPN 5,953,392 issued to Rhie et al.
10. 6,574,601 issued to Brown et al.
11. PCT WO 00/56033 Lonroth et al.
12. Borland, John. "Lucent Phone Browser Competing with Start-Ups." March 6, 2000. CNET News.com
13. VoiceXML Forum: Voice Extensible Markup Language VoiceXML, version 0.9,



Art Unit: 2143

Aug. 1999.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N Boutah whose telephone number is (703) 305-5104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 am-5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



ANB



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100